

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.**

Re



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/614,937	07/11/2000	Jeffry Jovan Philyaw	PHLY-25,356	2472
25883	7590	07/06/2004	EXAMINER	
HOWISON & ARNOTT, L.L.P			PHAN, TAM T	
P.O. BOX 741715			ART UNIT	
DALLAS, TX 75374-1715			PAPER NUMBER	
			2144	
DATE MAILED: 07/06/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/614,937

Applicant(s)

PHILYAW, JEFFRY JOVAN

Examiner

Tam (Jenny) Phan

Art Unit

2144

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 April 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16, 18-33 and 35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16, 18-33 and 35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 July 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 04/30/2004.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This application has been examined. Amendment A received on 04/28/2004 has been entered. Claims 1 and 19 are amended. Claims 2-16, 18-33, and 35 are original. Claims 17 and 34 are cancelled. Claims 1-16, 18-33, and 35 are presented for examination.

Priority

2. This application is a CIP of 09/378,221 (08/19/1999), which is a CIP of 09/151,471 (09/11/1998) and is a CIP of 09/151,530 (09/11/1998) U.S. Patent Number 6,098,106.

3. The effective filing date for the subject matter defined in the pending claims, which has support in parent 09/378,221 in this application, is 08/19/1999. Any new subject matter defined in the claims not previously disclosed in parent 09/378,221, is entitled to the effective filing date of 07/12/2000.

Information Disclosure Statement

4. An initialed and dated copy of Applicant's IDS form 1449, Received on 04/30/2004, is attached to the instant Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2144

6. Claims 1-12, 16, 18, 19-30, and 33, 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hudetz et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,978,773), hereinafter referred to as Hudetz, in view of Nelson (U.S. Patent Number 6,297,727) and further in view of Russell et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,905,248), hereinafter referred to as Russell.

7. Regarding claim 1, Hudetz disclosed a method of displaying a web page to a user (Figure 6, column 8 lines 17-20) comprising the steps of retrieving location information associated with the unique code from a database, the location information corresponding to a location of the web page on a remote location disposed on the network (Figure 4, column 9 lines 59-62, column 11 lines 33-60); in response to retrieving the location information, connecting the activation system to the remote location (column 11 lines 28-37); and presenting the web page corresponding to the location information of the remote location to the user via the activation system (Figure 6, column 9 lines 54-62).

8. Hudetz taught the invention substantially as claimed. However, Hudetz did not expressly disclose a method of providing a portable triggering device having a unique code stored therein and extracting the unique code from the triggering device with an activation system, the activation system disposed on a network and physically separates from the triggering device.

9. Hudetz suggested exploration of art and/or provided a reason to modify the method with the portable triggering device feature (Figure 8, column 6 lines 28-33, column 7 lines 17-28).

10. In an analogous art, Nelson disclosed a method of providing a portable triggering device having a unique code stored therein (Abstract, column 3 lines 10-13, column 5 lines 42-50) and extracting the unique code from the triggering device with an activation system, the activation system disposed on a network and physically separates from the triggering device (column 3 lines 10-13, column 11 lines 9-12).

11. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method of Hudetz with the teachings of Nelson in order to offer users a more automatic method in obtaining the identification code using the interrogator unit and the triggering device (Nelson, column 6 lines 8-21) since this would allow users to access published locations without having to manually enter the published address through input devices (Hudetz, column 2 lines 53-55).

12. The combination of Hudetz and Nelson taught the invention substantially as claimed. However, the combination of Hudetz and Nelson did not teach in response to retrieving the location information, *automatically* connecting the activation system to the remote location.

13. Hudetz suggested exploration of art and/or provided a reason to modify the method with the automatic connection with the remote location (column 2 lines 52-67).

14. Russell disclosed a method wherein in response to retrieving the location information, *automatically* connecting the activation system to the remote location (Title, Abstract, column 2 lines 46-67, column 3 lines 1-26).

15. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the combined method of Hudetz and Nelson with the

Art Unit: 2144

teachings of Russell to include the automatic connection feature in order to allow users to access published locations automatically without manual inputs (Hudetz, column 2 lines 52-67).

16. Regarding claim 2, Nelson disclosed a method wherein the triggering device in the step of providing is a portable wireless passive transponder (Figure 1a sign 22, Figure 3 sign 34, column 1 lines 40-47, column 5 lines 42-47, column 7 lines 1-5).

17. Regarding claim 3, Nelson disclosed a method wherein the passive transponder has the unique code stored therein in a non-volatile memory (Abstract, column 3 lines 10-13, column 5 lines 42-47, column 1 lines 56-61, column 12 lines 4-13).

18. Regarding claim 4, Hudetz disclosed a method wherein the unique code in the step of providing is uniquely associated with the web page (Figure 4, column 9 lines 54-62).

19. Regarding claim 5, Nelson disclosed a method wherein the triggering device further includes a unique transponder identification code stored therein, the unique transponder identification code being exclusively associated with that triggering device (column 5 lines 59-66, column 6 lines 9-25).

20. Regarding claim 6, Nelson disclosed a method wherein the step of extracting further includes extracting the unique transponder identification code from the triggering device with the activation system (column 6 lines 9-25, column 5 lines 59-66, lines 39-54).

Art Unit: 2144

21. Regarding claim 7, Nelson disclosed a method wherein the step of retrieving location information further comprises the step of matching the unique code and the unique transponder identification code with the location information of the database (column 3 lines 1-5, column 5 lines 59-66, column 11 lines 48-55).

22. Regarding claim 8, Nelson disclosed a method wherein the activation system in the step of extracting comprises a transmitter and a receiver each operatively connected to a interrogator unit [computer], the transmitter for activating the triggering device with an activating signal, and the receiver for receiving a triggering signal having the unique code contained therein (Figure 3, column 6 lines 13-23, lines 39-54).

23. Regarding claim 9, Nelson disclosed a method wherein the step of retrieving location information further comprises the step of matching the unique code with the location information of the database (column 9 lines 42-45, column 10 lines 29-36, lines 3-10).

24. Regarding claim 10, Hudetz disclosed a method wherein the database in the step of retrieving is local to the activation system (column 7 lines 51-57).

25. Regarding claim 11, Hudetz disclosed a method wherein the database in the step of retrieving is located at an intermediary location on the network (Figure 1 sign 60, Figure 4, column 7 lines 43-51).

26. Regarding claim 12, Hudetz disclosed a method wherein the step of retrieving location information from the intermediary location further comprises the step of appending to the unique code routing information which defines the location of the intermediary location on the network such that the unique code is transmitted to the

intermediary location in accordance with the appended routing information (column 11 lines 28-37).

27. Regarding claim 16, Hudetz disclosed a method wherein the step of connecting is performed using a browser program (Figure 6, column 1 lines 46-52, column 10 lines 55-67).

28. Regarding claim 18, Hudetz disclosed a method wherein the step of presenting comprises displaying the web page to the user via display operatively connected to the activation system (Figure 6, column 9 lines 54-62).

29. Regarding claims 19-30, 33, and 35, the apparatus corresponds directly to the method of claims 1-12 and 16-18, and thus these claims are rejected using the same rationale.

30. Since all the limitations of the claimed invention were disclosed by the combination of Hudetz and Nelson, claims 1-12, 16, 18, 19-30, 33, and 35 are rejected.

31. Claims 13-15 and 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hudetz et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,978,773), hereinafter referred to as Hudetz, in view of Nelson (U.S. Patent Number 6,297,727), in view of Russell et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,905,248), hereinafter referred to as Russell as applied above, and further in view of Wellner (U.S. Patent Number 5,640,193).

32. Regarding claim 13, Hudetz disclosed a method of displaying a web page to a user (Figure 6, column 8 lines 17-20) comprising the steps of retrieving location information associated with the unique code from a database, the location information

corresponding to a location of the web page on a remote location disposed on the network (Figure 4, column 9 lines 59-62, column 11 lines 33-60); in response to retrieving the location information, connecting the activation system to the remote location (column 11 lines 28-37); and presenting the web page corresponding to the location information of the remote location to the user via the activation system (Figure 6, column 9 lines 54-62). Nelson disclosed a method of providing a portable triggering device having a unique code stored therein (Abstract, column 3 lines 10-13, column 5 lines 42-50) and extracting the unique code from the triggering device with an activation system, the activation system disposed on a network and physically separates from the triggering device (column 3 lines 10-13, column 11 lines 9-12). Russell disclosed a method wherein in response to retrieving the location information, *automatically* connecting the activation system to the remote location (Title, Abstract, column 2 lines 46-67, column 3 lines 1-26).

33. The combination of Hudetz, Nelson, and Russell did not disclose a method wherein the activation system in the step of extracting further includes a unique interface identification code associated with the activation system. However, in an analogous art, Wellner disclosed a method wherein the activation system in the step of extracting further includes a unique interface identification code associated with the activation system (Abstract, column 1 lines 36-42, column 7 lines 3-10).

34. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the combined teachings of Hudetz and Nelson with the teachings of Richton to include a unique interface identification code in order to allow a

user to control the selection of electronic services to be provided to the user by one or more servers over a communication medium (Wellner, column 1 lines 33-36) because this enables the selected electronic service transmitted from the servers to be received by the user's receiver (Wellner, column 1 lines 42-44).

35. Regarding claim 14, Wellner disclosed a method wherein the step of retrieving location information further comprises the step of appending the unique interface identification code to the unique code and transmitting it to the database (column 1 lines 36-42, column 5 lines 46-55).

36. Regarding claim 15, Wellner disclosed a method wherein the step of retrieving location information further comprises the step of matching the unique code and the unique interface identification code with the location information of the database (column 1 lines 36-42, column 4 lines 46-52). Hudetz also disclosed this matching step at column 8 lines 47-53).

37. Regarding claims 31-32, the apparatus corresponds directly to the method of claims 13-15, and thus these claims are rejected using the same rationale.

38. Since all the limitations of the claimed invention were disclosed by the combination of Hudetz, Nelson, Russell, and Wellner, claims 13-15 and 31-32 are rejected.

39. Claims 19-22, 24, 26, 28-29, and 33,35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rothschild (U.S. Patent Number 6,430,554) and further in view of Schmitt et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,903,225), hereinafter referred to as Schmitt.

40. Regarding claim 19, Rothschild disclosed an apparatus for displaying a web page to a user (Figure 1) comprising: an activation system disposed on a network for extracting the unique code from said triggering device, said activation system physically separate from said triggering device (Figure 1, column 3 lines 16-26, lines 40-45); wherein location information associated with said unique is retrieved from a database, said location information correspond to a location of the web page on a remote location disposed on said network (column 2 lines 45-54, column 3 lines 52-63); wherein in response to said location information being retrieved from said database, said activation system is automatically connected to said remote location (Figure 1, column 2 lines 45-54, column 3 lines 39-44, column 5 lines 3-15, column 6 lines 20-32); wherein the corresponding web page of said remote location is presented to the user via said activation system (column 3 lines 52-63, column 6 lines 27-32).

41. Rothschild taught the invention substantially as claimed; however, Rothschild did not expressly disclose a portable triggering device of a user having a unique code stored therein.

42. Rothschild suggested exploration of art and/or provided a reason to modify the apparatus with the portable triggering device of a user having a unique code stored therein [Rothschild disclosed an article of commerce having a unique stored therein] (column 1 lines 38-49).

43. In an analogous art, Schmitt disclosed a portable triggering device [passive transponder] of a user having a unique code stored therein (Abstract, Figure 14, column 2 lines 51-60).

44. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the apparatus of Rothschild with the teachings of Schmitt to include a portable triggering device of a user having a unique code stored therein in order to eliminate the cumbersome scanner because the triggering device would communicate with the activation system automatically when the user is in contact with the activation system (Schmitt, column 12 lines 4-55). In addition, the portable triggering device would prevent the users through the inconvenience of locating and manipulating the reader or scanner system (Schmitt, column 2 line 61-column 3 line 3).

45. Regarding claim 20, Schmitt disclosed an apparatus wherein the triggering device is a portable wireless passive transponder (Abstract, column 3 lines 7-11, lines 53-57).

46. Regarding claim 21, Schmitt disclosed an apparatus wherein said passive transponder has said unique code stored therein in a non-volatile memory (column 3 lines 14-17, lines 22-26, column 12 lines 11-14, lines 25-33).

47. Regarding claim 22, Rothschild disclosed an apparatus wherein said unique code is uniquely associated with the webpage (column 3 lines 59-63).

48. Regarding claim 24, Schmitt disclosed an apparatus wherein said activation system comprises a transmitter and a receiver each operatively connected to a computer, said transmitter for activating said triggering device with an activating signal, and said receiver for receiving a triggering signal having said unique code contained therein (Figure 14, column 2 lines 51-60, column 3 lines 7-14).

49. Regarding claim 26, Rothschild disclosed an apparatus wherein said unique code is matched with said location information of said database (column 2 lines 45-52, column 5 lines 3-15, column 7 lines 39-49).
50. Regarding claim 28, Rothschild disclosed an apparatus wherein said database is local to said activation system (column 3 lines 33-45, column 7 lines 50-53).
51. Regarding claim 29, Rothschild disclosed an apparatus wherein said database is located at an intermediary location on said network (column 2 lines 45-52, column 7 lines 50-53).
52. Regarding claim 33, Rothschild disclosed an apparatus wherein said activation is connected to said remote location using a browser program (column 3 lines 59-63, column 6 lines 57-62).
53. Regarding claim 35, Rothschild disclosed an apparatus wherein the webpage is presented to the user via a video display operatively connected to said activation system (Figure 1, column 7 lines 54-60).
54. Since all the limitations of the claimed invention were disclosed by the combination of Rothschild and Schmitt, claims 19-22, 24, 26, 28-29, 33, and 35 are rejected.

Response to Arguments

55. Applicants' arguments in Amendment A, filed 04/28/2004 with respect to the pending claims 1-12, 16-18, 19-30, and 33-35 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

56. In response to applicant's argument that the Nelson reference is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the storing of identification code either found in the UPC symbol or in the portable transportable is analogous regardless of its intended usage.

57. In response to applicant's argument that "The purpose of the Nelson document is to look up information in a relational database. As such the code stored in the transponder will be utilized in a relational database to look up specific information. It will not look up information that can be utilized to jump to a different location on a network." And "The type of information that is retrieved is not the same, i.e. is not utilized to jump to a different location on the network." The Office contends that a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). Thus, the Office fails to recognize how the information disclosed in the Hudetz reference is different from the information disclosed in the Nelson reference.

58. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the information stored in the database automatically causes a "jump" to the appropriate and associated remote location; and There is no disclosure in Nelson that indicates that the transponder has any usefulness other than as a carrier of the recipient's code) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

59. In response to Applicant argument that "there is no disclosure of two codes being stored in the transponder that can be transmitted to a location on the network having a database disposed thereat for looking up routing information therefrom." The Office contends that Nelson disclosed this limitation as detailed in the rejection above. As stated by Nelson, "In addition to storing the identification code, additional storage capacity of the transponder memory, if any, may be used to store additional information such as transponder operational programming, coding, messages, user information, owner information, access information for accessing a database including records comprising information relating to a plurality of identification codes and corresponding code recipients, and the like." This clearly disclosed that the transponder was capable of storing other codes besides the identification code.

60. As the rejection reads, Examiner asserts that the combination of these teachings render the claimed invention obvious.

61. Applicant's arguments filed 04/28/2004 regarding pending claims 19-22, 24, 26, 28-29, and 33-35 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

62. Applicants' response to the application of Rothschild and Schmitt et al. argued "Applicant believes that there is no motivation to combine the Schmitt and Rothschild references for the purpose of utilizing the transponder of Schmitt to provide a code that can automatically access a web page by the mere fact of being proximate in location to the activation device." In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the Office contends that the motivation to combine the Rothschild and Schmitt references is detailed in the rejection above. Thus, the combination of Rothschild and Schmitt is considered valid.

63. As the rejection reads, Examiner asserts that the combination of these teachings render the claimed invention obvious.

Conclusion

64. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

65. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

66. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Refer to the enclosed PTO-892 for details.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tam (Jenny) Phan whose telephone number is (703) 305-4665. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Cuchlinski can be reached on 703-308-3873. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Art Unit: 2144

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

William Cuchlinski
SPE
Art Unit 2144
703-308-3873

tp
June 29, 2004



WILLIAM A. CUCHLINSKI, JR.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600